

REMARKS

New claims 19-28 are pending for further examination. Claims 1-18 are canceled.

Originally filed claims 1-4 and 9-11 were rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194137 (Park et al.). Claims 5-8 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over the Park et al. reference in view of Meiji (Japanese Patent Publication Number 2002-023625).

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

New independent claim 19 recites a cardless sales method in a cardless sales system. The method includes (1) encrypting card information with a first key to generate first information, (2) encrypting the first information with a second key to generate second information, (3) issuing, from an issuing device, third information that includes the first and second information to a mobile communication terminal, (4) separating, in a sales processing device, the first and second information from the third information, (5) encrypting the separated first information with the second key, (6) comparing the separated second information with the encrypted separated first information and (7) determining that the card information is valid if the separated second information coincides with the encrypted separated first information. If the card information is valid, then a predetermined sales process is performed based on the card issuing information.

Similarly, new independent claim 24 recites a cardless sales system that includes: an issuing device with (1) a first generating means to generate first information by encrypting card information with a first key, (2) a second generating means to generate second information by encrypting the first information, and (3) an issuing means to issue third information that includes the first and second information; and a sales processing device with (4) a separating means to separate the first and second information from the third information, (5) an encryption means to encrypt the separated first information with the second key, and (6) a determination means to

determine whether card information is valid by comparing the separated second information with the encrypted separated first information.

Those features can be appreciated with reference, for example, to FIG. 1 of the present application, which illustrates a cardless sales system that includes a card information issuing server 1, a mobile telephone 7 and a vending machine 18. The card information issuing server 1 creates card issuing information 34 that includes (a) first information (*i.e.*, encrypted card information 36) obtained by encrypting card information 33 with a first key (encryption key A); and (b) second information (*i.e.*, card authentication information 35) obtained by encrypting, with a second key (encryption key B), the encrypted card information 36. During a transaction, the mobile telephone 7 transmits the card issuing information 34 to the vending machine 18. The vending machine 18 separates the received card issuing information 34 into the first information (*i.e.*, encrypted card information 36) and second information (*i.e.*, card authentication information 35). The vending machine 18 then determines the validity of the card issuing information 34 by encrypting the received first information and comparing the encrypted first information with the received second information. If the encrypted first information matches the received second information, the card information is considered valid.

Advantageously, implementing the foregoing features enables a vending machine to validate the card information based on the information received from the mobile telephone without requiring communication, at the time of sale, with devices (*e.g.*, credit card company servers) that are remotely located relative to the point of sale.

In contrast, neither the Park et al. reference nor the Meiji reference discloses the features of pending claims 19 and 24. Regarding the Park et al. reference, two techniques are disclosed to validate/authenticate credit information, neither of which includes the features of pending claims 19 and 24. According to the first technique, a credit card inquiry machine 30 transmits received credit information from a portable terminal 10 for authentication externally, for example, to the credit card company (*see ¶ 201*). The Park et al. reference fails to disclose that this technique includes any of the claimed features including, for example, “separating” the received credit information, “encrypting” the received credit information, “comparing” encrypted and separated

credit information with separated credit information or validating the received credit information in a sales processing device.

According to the second technique of the Park et al. reference, the credit card inquiry machine 30 maintains a “blacklist” of card information and ascertains whether the received card information corresponds to a “blacklist” entry to identify the validity of the card (*see ¶ 223*). Although this technique does not require sending the card information to an external device, there is no disclosure that the technique includes the features of pending claims 19 and 24.

The Meiji reference discloses a method of maintaining secrecy with respect to data that involves separating and decoding first and second encryption rows to form an encryption sentence but fails to disclose the claimed features including, for example, “encrypting” separated first information with a second key and “comparing” that encrypted separated first information with separated second information to determine whether card information is valid.

At least for the foregoing reasons, claims 19 and 24 should be allowed.

Claims 20-23 depend from claim 19 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

Claims 25-28 depend from claim 24 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 24.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Michihiro Ota  
Serial No. : 10/537,441  
Filed : June 2, 2005  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 19291-002US1 / MEC0923-C-  
676US

No fee is believed due. However, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/30/07



Samuel Borodach  
Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Citigroup Center  
52nd Floor  
153 East 53rd Street  
New York, New York 10022-4611  
Telephone: (212) 765-5070  
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291